REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Claims 17-22 were withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 11 and 15 were objected to.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 11 and 15 were objected to because of informalities. Applicant has responded by amending claims 1, 3-4, 6, 11 and 15.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,592,401 issued to Kramer on January 7, 1997.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons. Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

> "multiple sensors that produce multiple signals based on multiple joint motions of an individual; and
>
> one or more processing components that employ one or more of the multiple signals to make a determination of a positional change of the individual;
>
> wherein the multiple sensors are adapted to be in contact with an ankle, knee, hip, waist, wrist, elbow, and shoulder of the individual, and wherein the multiple sensors produce signals for the one or more processing components to measure three dimensional motion of the ankle, the knee, the hip, the waist, the wrist, the elbow, and the shoulder; and
>
> wherein the multiple joint motions are measured and reconstructed from a known starting location and recorded position information to determine a path traversed by the individual."

Kramer does **not** teach this limitation. Instead, Kramer discloses a device for measuring the change in position of human body parts via the use of fast position sensors and delayed position sensors mounted on body part fitting supports. Kramer discloses specific types of fast position sensors and delayed position sensors for use on specific body parts. For example, Kramer discloses six degree of freedom (DOF) sensors which are placed on the wrist bands, forearm, hands, neck and shoulder blade of a golfer", as stated in column 17, lines 1-61. Also, Kramer discloses that bend sensors may be used in conjunction with the 6 DOF sensors on other body areas, such as the elbow and knee, as stated in column 6, lines 66 to column 7, line 2. Furthermore, Kramer discloses bend sensors affixed at the ankle to measure the bend of the ankle, as stated in column 15, lines 35-37. The bend sensors provide signals for a single-axis degree of freedom measurement, as stated in column 7, lines 10-14. Bend sensors appear to be a required structural aspect for some body joints in Kramer, because Kramer discloses in column 7, lines 6-14,

> "Depending on the particular bend sensor and structure used, the bend sensor may not provide accurate information at a complex joint or about the absolute orientation of an elongated body part around its long axis, However, since bend sensors can provide fast, non-drifting angle measurements about a single axis, the fast angle information may be used in combination with slow sensors to produce faster measurements of certain selected important single-axis degrees of freedom."

In essence, Kramer's bend sensors are limited to providing signals for measurements of the elbow, knee and ankle in only a single-axis degree of freedom. Kramer does **not** disclose any type of sensor measurements of the hip and the waist.

By contrast, applicant's claim 1 recites "wherein the multiple sensors are adapted to be in contact with an ankle, knee, hip, waist, wrist, elbow, and shoulder of the individual, and wherein the multiple sensors produce signals for the one or more processing components to measure three dimensional motion of the ankle, the knee, the hip, the waist, the wrist, the elbow, and the shoulder". Thus, Kramer is missing "the multiple sensors produce signals for the one or more processing components to measure three dimensional motion of the ankle, the knee, the elbow, the hip, and the waist" elements, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Kramer is that the multiple sensors do **not** produce signals for the one or more processing components to measure three dimensional motion of the ankle, the knee, the hip, the waist, the wrist, the elbow, and the shoulder.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that Kramer does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Kramer. Since claims 2-16 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Kramer.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kramer in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,013,007 issued to Root et al. on January 11, 2000.

Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection.

This rejection is based on the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the multiple sensors are adapted to be in contact with an ankle, knee, hip, waist, wrist, elbow, and shoulder of the individual, and wherein the multiple sensors produce signals for the one or more processing components to measure three dimensional motion of the ankle, the knee, the hip, the waist, the wrist, the elbow, and the shoulder", as recited in applicant's claim 1, the combination of Kramer and Root does **not** supply this missing element. Thus, this combination does **not** make obvious any of applicant's claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

New Claims

New claims 23-24 have been added. Claims 23-24 provide additional limitations directed to the multiple sensors. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: September 28, 2007

Patti, Hewitt & Arezina, LLC
Customer Number 32205